# Turkish nursing students' compliance to standard precautions during the COVID-19 pandemic

**Sevcan Topçu** Corresp., 1 , **Zuhal Emlek Sert** 2

1 Ege University, İzmir, Turkey

2 Ege University, Izmir, Turkey

Corresponding Author: Sevcan Topçu
Email address: sevcan.topcu@hotmail.com

**Objectives.** The purpose of this study was to assess nursing students' compliance to standard precautions during the COVID-19 pandemic. **Methods.** A cross-sectional study was conducted from December 2021 to June 2022, 816 nursing students participated in the study. A socio-demographic questionnaire and the Compliance with Standard Precautions Scale were sued to collect data. Means and percentages were used to report socio-demographic characteristics Multiple regression analysis used to identify the factors influencing compliance with standard precautions. **Results.** The average age of nursing students was 21.30 ± 1.31 years. The majority of nursing students were female, with 703 (86.2%) being female and 113 (13.8%) being male. Compliance among nursing students was 76.8% overall. Nursing students reported the highest compliance (97.7%) with putting used sharp items into sharp boxes, with 97.1% compliance for covering mouth and nose when wearing a mask. Participants reported the lowest (38.6%) when it came to not recapping used needles after giving an injection. Regression analysis revealed that gender, year of study, and having needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids experience all influenced nursing students' compliance with standard precautions. **Conclusions.** During the pandemic, nursing students compliance to standard precautions was optimal, according to this study. More research should be done to assess nursing students' compliance with standard precautions and the effect of infection control strategies used to prevent COVID-19 transmission.

# Turkish nursing students' compliance to standard precautions during The COVID-19 Pandemic

Sevcan Topçu[1] Zuhal Emlek Sert[2]

[1] Public Health Nursing, Ege University Faculty of Nursing, Izmir, Turkey
[2] Public Health Nursing, Ege University Faculty of Nursing, Izmir, Turkey

Corresponding Author:
Sevcan Topçu[1]
Ege University Faculty of Nursing, Bornova, Izmir, 35030, Turkey
Email address: sevcan.topcu@hotmail.com

**Funding**
The authors received no funding for this work.
**Competing Interests**
The authors declare there are no competing interests.
**Author Contributions**
Sevcan Topçu conceived and designed the research, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
Zuhal Emlek Sert conceived and designed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
**Human Ethics**
The following information was supplied relating to ethical approvals (i.e., approving body and any reference numbers):
The research protocol was approved by Ege University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (Approval Number: 13/09-1213).

**Data Availability**
The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author and with permission of the Institutional Review Board of Ege University.

## Abstract

**Objectives.** The aim of this study was to assess nursing students'the compliance to standard precautions among NSs during the COVID-19 pandemic..
**Methods.** A cross-sectional study was conducted from December 2021 to June 2022, 816 nursing students participated in the study. A socio-demographic questionnaire and Compliance with Standard Precautions Scale were used to collect data. Means and percentages were used to report socio-demographic characteristics Multiple regression analysis used to identify the factors influencing compliance with standard precautions.

46 **Results.** The mean age of nursing students was 21.30±1.31 years. The majority of nursing
47 students were female, with 703 (86.2%) being female and 113 (13.8%) being male. Compliance
48 among nursing students was 76.8% overall. Nursing students reported the highest compliance
49 (97.7%) with putting used sharp articles into sharp boxes, with 97.1% compliance for covering
50 mouth and nose when wearing a mask. Participants reported the lowest (38.6%) when it came to
51 not recapping used needles after giving an injection. Regression analysis revealed that gender,
52 year of study, and having needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids experience all
53 influenced nursing students' compliance with standard precautions.
54 **Conclusions.** During the pandemic, nursing students compliance to standard precautions was
55 optimal, according to this study. More research should be done to assess nursing students'
56 compliance with standard precautions and the effect of infection control strategies used to
57 prevent COVID-19 transmission.
58 **Keywords** Standard precautions, Nursing students, COVID-19.

59
60
61

## Introduction

63 Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) are infections contracted while undergoing treatment for
64 another condition (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control [ECDC], 2022; U.S.
65 Department of Health and Human Services [HHS], 2021). HAIs not only endanger the patients'
66 health and lives, but they also impose additional emotional and financial burdens on patients,
67 their families and the healthcare system, such as direct economic loss and prolonged
68 hospitalization (HHS, 2021; Jia et al., 2019). While HAIs primarily  affect patients, they also
69 affect healthcare workers (HCWs) and students who are regularly exposed to bacteria, fungi,
70 viruses, or other pathogens that cause HAIs (Brosio et al., 2017). Respiratory tract infections,
71 surgical site infections, urinary tract infections, bloodstream infections, and gastrointestinal
72 infections are the most commonly reported types of HAIs (ECDC, 2022). The ECDC reported
73 8.9 million HAIs in European hospitals and long-term care facilities in 2018 (ECDC, 2018).
74 They estimated that one out of every 15 patients in hospitals and one out of every 26 patients in
75 long-term care facilities had HAIs (ECDC, 2018).
76      COVID-19 first appeared in in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, (WHO, 2020a). It
77 quickly spread throughout the world, and the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the
78 COVID-19 outbreak a global pandemic in March 2020 (WHO, 2020a). The rapid spread of
79 COVID-19 resulted high hospitalization rates, necessitating an increase in total hospital capacity
80 (McCabe et al., 2020). The efforts of healthcare facilities to quickly adapt to increased hospital
81 demand influenced HAI rates (WHO, 2020b). According to the Centers for Disease Control and
82 Prevention (CDC), the incidence of central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs),
83 catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTIs), ventilator-associated events (VAEs), and
84 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) bacteremia in 2021 will be significantly
85 higher than in 2019 (CDC, 2022; Weiner-Lastinger et al., 2022). Also, among all HAIs types,
86 VAEs experienced the greatest increase in the third quarter of 2021, when the Delta variant
87 drove COVID-19-related hospitalizations to all-time highs (CDC, 2022; Weiner-Lastinger et al.,
88 2022). COVID-19, on the other hand, had a positive effect on some HAIs, including
89 Clostridioides difficile (C. diff) (CDC, 2022; Weiner-Lastinger et al., 2022). It was discovered
90 that C. diff infections in healthcare settings have significantly decreased as a result of pandemic-
91 related improvements such as hand hygiene, personal protective equipment (PPE) practices, and

92  environmental cleaning (CDC, 2022; Weiner-Lastinger t al., 2022). The COVID-19 burdens on
93  healthcare systems may also limit their ability to sustain surveillance, which is the foundation of
94  the fight against HAIs (Wee et al., 2021).
95          Compliance with standard precautions (SPs) is the most effective way to prevent HAIs
96  (Arruum et al., 2021). In 1996, the CDC changed the infection control practice from Universal
97  Precautions to Standard Precautions. SPs are based on the premise that all blood, body fluids,
98  secretions, excretions (except sweat), nonintact skin, and mucous membranes may contain
99  infectious agents that are transmissible. SPs are infection-prevention practices that apply to all
100 patient care, regardless of whether the patient is suspected or confirmed to have infection, in any
101 setting where health care is provided (CDC,2018). SPs aim to protect both health workers and
102 patients by lowering the risk of microorganism transmission from both recognized and unknown
103 sources (WHO, 2022). SPs, when followed consistently, can prevent the spread of
104 microorganisms between patients, health workers, and the environment. Risk assessment, hand
105 hygiene, respiratory hygiene and cough etiquette, patient placement, PPE, aseptic technique, safe
106 injections and sharp injury prevention, environmental cleaning, handling of laundry and linen,
107 waste management, decontamination and reprocessing of reusable patient care items and
108 equipment, decontamination of spilled wastes, proper disposal, and the prevention of cross
109 infection are all important components of SPs (CDC, 2018; WHO, 2022). As a result, it is critical
110 for HCWs to follow SPs. To prevent COVID-19 transmission in healthcare facilities during the
111 COVID-19 pandemic, aggressive Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) measures such as the
112 use of PPE (especially masks), droplet and contact isolation precautions for patients with
113 respiratory symptoms, and visitor restrictions were implemented. Because of concerns about
114 cost-effectiveness and sustainability prior to the COVID-19, such strategies were used in high-
115 risk units such as intensive care units and infection clinics (Wee et al., 2021). Attention to
116 traditional HAIs prevention programs and long-established infection control measures among
117 HCWs decreased during COVID-19 due to increased total hospital capacity and hospitalization
118 rates, as well as controlled personnel availability. (Weiner-Lastinger et al., 2022; Deiana et al.,
119 2022). Due to a shortage of nurses during the pandemic, nursing students (NSs) were among the
120 frontline HCWs in healthcare facilities, particularly COVID-19 clinics (Yılmaz et al., 2021).
121 NSs, as members of the healthcare team, play a critical role in the prevention of HAIs because
122 they treat and care for a diverse range of patients during their clinical placement. Many studies
123 were conducted prior to the pandemic to assess NSs compliance with SPs. According to these
124 studies,  NSs' compliance with SPs was low or moderate (Bouchoucha et al., 2021; Cruz, 2019;
125 Moon, Hyeon, Lim, 2019). Nonetheless, evidence for the effect of COVID-19 on NSs'
126 compliance with SPs is limited. As a result, the purpose of this study was to assess NSs'
127 compliance with SPs during the COVID-19.
128 Study questions:
129 •   What is the NSs' compliance with standard precautions during COVID-19?
130 •   Is there a difference in compliance with SPs among NSs based on key sample
131     characteristics such as gender, year of study, needlestick injury, or contact with
132     blood/body fluids?
133
134

## Materials & Methods
### Study design and sampling

137    From December 2021 to June 2022, a cross-sectional survey was conducted at a nursing school
138    in Turkey. This study's population consisted of Bachelor of Science in NSs who had already
139    begun their practical training period. The study employed convenience sampling. The study's
140    sample included 925 second, third, and fourth-year NSs. The study's inclusion criteria were (1)
141    voluntary study participation and (2) being in the practical training period.
142    Because of their lack of clinical experience, first-year NSs were barred from participating. This
143    study included all NSs who met the inclusion criteria.
144    **Data collection**
145    Before each class's teaching session, researchers explained the purpose and procedure of the
146    study and invited NSs in their second, third, and fourth years to participate in the paper-based
147    questionnaire survey. The paper survey was distributed to NSs who agreed to participate in the
148    study. The questionnaire was distributed to 910 second-year students. The study included 816
149    NSs who completed a self-administered the survey. Researchers assured NSs that their
150    participation in the survey would be entirely voluntary and confidential, and that it would have
151    no bearing on their grades.
152    **Instruments**
153    The socio-demographic uestionnaire and Compliance with Standard Precautions Scale (CSPS)
154    were used to collect data (Lam, 2011). The socio-demographic uestionnaire included four
155    questions: age, gender, year of study, needle-stick injury, or contact with blood/body fluids.
156         The CSPS is a self-reported compliance with SPs among nurses and NSs based on
157    international preventive measures developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
158    and the World Health Organization (Lam, 2011). Lam developed the CSPS by modifying the
159    Universal Precautions Scale because SPs combine the major features of Universal Precautions
160    and Body Substance Isolation. The CSPS assesses compliance with the major dimensions of SPs
161    and was comprehensively designed to describe the daily routine of nurses or NSs in performing
162    infection control practices in their work (Cruz et al., 2016; Lam, 2011). CSPS consist of 20
163    items, and five areas that include use of protective devices (or PPE) (6 items), disposal of sharps
164    (3 items), disposal of waste (3 items), decontamination of spills and used articles (1 item), and
165    prevention of cross-infection from person to person (7 items).  The response set is a 4-point
166    Likert-scale with responses like "never," "seldom," "sometimes," and "always." With the
167    majority of the items being positively worded statements, except for questions 2, 4, 6, and 15.
168    Only the "always" option in positively worded statements and the "never" option in negatively
169    worded statements receive a score of 1. The other options receive no points. The total scores
170    range from 0 to 20, with a higher score indicating greater compliance with SPs. The compliance
171    rate is th percentage of  average compliance with all 20 items (Lam, 2014). Samur, Intepeler, and
172    Lam (2020) conducted a Turkish validity and reliability study with 411 nurses. In this study, the
173    Turkish version CSPS was used. The Turkish version of the CSPS demonstrated good internal
174    consistency and reliability (Cronbach's α, 0.71; intraclass correlation coefficient, 0.84). The
175    content validity of the scake was 0.99. The authors have permission from the copyright holders
176    to use this instrument.
177    **Data analyses**
178    The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 21 was used to analyze the data.. For the
179    sociodemographic variables and NSs' compliance with SPs, descriptive statistics (mean,
180    percentage, etc.) were used.  Multiple regression analysis was used to identify key independent
181    variables using the compliance rate with SPs as the dependent variable. As independent
182    variables, gender, year of study, needlestick injury, or contact with blood/body fluids were

183    identified. For the detection of multicollinearity, values for the variance inflation factor (>10)
184    and tolerance level (<0.1) were used (Dorman et al., 2013). For all effects, we used the standard
185    significance level of α = 0.05.
186
**Ethical considerations**
187
188    To conduct the study, permission was obtained from Ege University Scientific Research and
189    Publication Ethics Committee (Approval Number: 13/09-1213). Before data collection,
190    participants were informed about the research objectives and procedures, and their written
191    permission was obtained via an informed consent form. All participants were informed that their
192    participation in the study entirely voluntary and would have no bearing on their grades.
193

## Results

194
195    The mean age of NSs' was 21.30±1.31 years (range=19-31). The majority of NSs were female,
196    with 703 (86.2%) being female and 113 (13.8%) being male. Of NSs, 311 (38.1%) were second-
197    year students, 274 (33.6%) were third-year students and 231 (28.3%) were fourth-year students.
198    Only 8.6% of NSs experienced needlestick injuries or contact with blood/body fluids (Table 1).
199        Among NSs, the overall of compliance rate was 76.8%. The NSs reported the highest
200    compliance with putting used sharp articles into sharp boxes (97.7%), with 97.1% compliance
201    for covering mouth and nose when wearing a mask, and 93.0% compliance for wearing gloves
202    when exposed to body fluids, blood products and any excretion of patients (Table 2). The NSs
203    reported the lowest compliance in the not recapping used needles after giving an injection
204    (38.6%), followed by using alcoholic hand rubs as an alternative if hands are not visibly soiled
205    (55.4%),
206        A multiple regression analysis was used to identify variables that were independently
207    related to NSs' compliance with SPs (Table 3). The model was statistically significant (F=77.75,
208    p < 0.05). It accounted for roughly 28 % of the variance in SPs compliance. All of the
209    independent variables were significantly associated with more favorable compliance with SPs (p
210    = 0.001). Having needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids experience had the highest
211    relative effect, as indicated by the standardized beta value (β = −0.40). Gender (β = −0.26) and
212    year of study (being third year β = −0.12; being fourth year β = −0.19) were other independent
213    variables associated with SP compliance.  Being female, being in your second year of nursing
214    school, and not having had a needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids were all
215    associated with higher compliance with SPs.
216

## Discussion

217
218    The study assessed how COVID-19 affected NSs' compliance with SPs. During the pandemic,
219    the overall rate of compliance with SPs among NSs was 76.8%. Colet et al. (2021) and
220    Alshammari et al., (2018) used CSPS to assess compliance with SPs among Saudi NSs. They
221    (2021) dicovered that prior to the pandemic, the overall compliance rate with SPs was 61% and
222    60.1%, respectively. Bouchoucha et al. (2021) used CSPS to assess compliance with SPs among
223    Australian NSs. In a nonpandemic environment, they reported that Australian NSs had good
224    compliance with SPs (68.9%). During the COVID-19 pandemic, Rizk and Siam (2021) assessed
225    the effect of the telenursing education program on Egyptian nurses' compliance with SPs using
226    the same measurement tool (CSPS). Prior to telenursing education, the overall compliance rate
227    with SPs among nurses was 66.2%. Albaqawi et al. (2021) used a different measurement tool to
228    assess COVID-19 prevention behaviors among Saudi NSs.. They found that NSs' used COVID-

229 19 prevention behaviors effectively. In terms of health systems, Turkey shares similarities with
230 Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and the majority of health services are provided by the government.
231 Furthermore, Turkey, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia are Muslim countries. However, Australia differs
232 from Turkey in terms of healthcare financing and the religious structure of the society. WHO
233 (2020) recommended key IPC measures for health facilities during COVID-19, including
234 respiratory etiquette and hand hygiene best practices; contact, droplet, and airborne precautions;
235 adequate environmental cleaning and disinfection; ensuring adequate ventilation; isolation
236 facilities for COVID-19 patients; visitor restrictions; and, where possible, maintaining a physical
237 distance of at least 1 meter among all individuals in health facilities, especially in indoor settings.
238 These measures have a similar structure to the SPs used to prevent HAIs. Prior to clinical
239 placements during the pandemic, nursing schools and training hospitals routinely provided
240 students with training on infection control measures in COVID-19. Furthermore, to prevent
241 COVID-19 transmission, clinical nurse educators carefully followed up on IPC strategies
242 observed NSs in clinical placements during the pandemic. The implementation of these key IPC
243 pandemic measures has been effective in reducing HAIs such as C. diff (CDC, 2022; Lastinger et
244 al., 2022). However, increased pandemic-related IPC measures have resulted in an increase in
245 HAIs such as CLABSIs, CAUTIs, and VAEs during COVID-19 (Baker et al., 2022; CDC, 2022;
246 Lastinger et al., 2022). The compliance rate of Turkish NSs with SPs during the pandemic was
247 relatively high when compared to previous studies conducted prior to the pandemic that uses the
248 same measurement tool. The findings of this study indicate that IPC strategies used to prevent
249 COVID-19 transmission have a positive effect of on the compliance with SPs among NSs.
250    In this study, NSs reported 78.7% compliance with PPE use. According to current
251 evidence, COVID-19 spreads primarily through respiratory droplets, but it may also spread
252 through contact with contaminated surfaces. As a result, WHO advised HCWs to to wear masks
253 continuously in areas where there is a patient with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 and to use
254 gloves when necessary (WHO, 2021). In this study, NSs reported the highest compliance with
255 covering their mouth and nose when wearing a mask (97.1%), as well as wearing gloves when
256 exposed to body fluids, blood products and any excretion of patients (93%). Many studies
257 conducted prior to the pandemic found that, NSs wore gloves with high compliance
258 (Bouchoucha et al., 2021; Donati et al., 2019). However, when compared to this study, most
259 studies found that NSs were less likely to cover their mouth and nose when wearing a mask
260 (Alshammari et al., 2018; Bouchoucha et al., 2021; Colet et al., 2017). Another interesting
261 finding from this study is that 31.9% of NSs reuse a surgical mask or disposable PPE. This could
262 be due to a lack of PPE in clinical settings during the pandemic.
263    Although NSs were highly compliant with disposing of used sharp articles into sharp
264 boxes, they were the least compliant with not recapping used needles after injections. Capturing
265 used needles is the leading cause of needlestick injuries among NSs in our country (Kepenek,
266 Şahin-Eker, 2017). Colet et al. (2017) found that 49.2% of NSs in a cross-sectional study with
267 NSs in Saudi Arabia did not recap used needles after administering an injection. According to
268 Bouchucha et al. (2021), NSs have a 75.1% compliance rate with not recapping used needles. In
269 a study of Ghanaian NSs during the pandemic, 21.4% reported never recapping used needles
270 (Balegha et al., 2021). Furthermore, during the pandemic, NSs' compliance with not recapping
271 used needles decreased. This outcome could be attributed to a decreased emphasis on other
272 prevention strategies as a result of increased pandemic-related IPC measures. Low compliance
273 among NSs for recapping used needles is undesirable because it may lead to an increase in the
274 number of occupational accidents.

275    NSs reported high compliance with waste disposal and decontamination of spills and
276    used article. 91.4% of those polled said they always decontaminated surfaces and equipment
277    after use and 86.6% reported they wore gloves to decontaminate used equipment with visible
278    soils. However, the compliance rate for immediately cleaning up spilled blood or other bodily
279    fluids with disinfectants is 77.0%. A previous study of Saudi NSs found that wearing gloves to
280    decontaminate used equipment with visible soils (64.8%), decontaminating surfaces and
281    equipment after use (52.5%), and immediately cleaning up spilled blood or other body fluids
282    with disinfectants (62.3%) were all low compliance measures (Colet et al., 2017). A study with
283    Australian NSs found that compliance with cleaning up spilled blood or other body fluids
284    immediately with disinfectants (86%) was high, compliance with decontaminating surfaces and
285    equipment after use (78.5) was low, and compliance with wearing gloves to decontaminate used
286    equipment with visible soils (88.2%) was low (Bouchoucha et al., 2021). These findings revealed
287    that compliance with waste disposal and decontamination of spills and used article among NSs
288    varies from country to country and culture to culture regardless of whether the pandemic
289    occurred before or after.
290    Participants reported 75.5% compliance with strategies to prevent person to person cross-
291    infection, with 91.1% compliance for decontaminating hands immediately after removing of
292    gloves, 85% compliance for changing gloves between patient contacts and 84% compliance for
293    washing hand between patient contacts. Only 55.4% of participants reported they use alcoholic
294    hand rubs as an alternative if their hands are not visibly soiled. According to the findings of this
295    study, compliance with the prevention of cross infection from person to person is quite high
296    when compared with to studies conducted prior to the pandemic (Alshammari et al., 2018; Colet
297    et al., 2017; Moon et al., 2019). In the current study, NSs reported low compliance with using
298    alcoholic hand rubs as an alternative if my hands were not visibly soiled. Hand washing and
299    disinfection were recommended by WHO (2021) as the most effective protective measures
300    against the COVID-19 pandemic. Hand hygiene and disinfectant use among HCWs increased at
301    the start of the pandemic, but returned to prepandemic levels over time (Sandbol et al., 2022;
302    Stangerup et al., 2021). The study was conducted in the first clinical placements of NSs during
303    the COVID-19 pandemic, which may explain high compliance with hand washing among NSs
304    As a result, compliance with hand hygiene among NSs should be re-evaluated following the
305    pandemic.
306    Female NSs had higher compliance with SPs than male NSs, according to our finding.
307    This gender gap in compliance with SPs was also observed in Saudi Arabia and the Croatia,
308    where female students outperformed male students (Alshammari et al., 2018; Colet et al., 2017;
309    Mestrovic et al., 2020). Cruz (2019) found that male NSs were more likely to comply with SPs
310    than female. Gender differences in SPs compliance with should be taken seriously in order to
311    understand why these differences occur and, eventually, to implement the necessary measures to
312    improve compliance. As a result, qualitative studies to investigate the possible causal
313    relationship between gender and compliance with SPs are suggested. This study found that
314    second-years NSs had higher compliance with SPs than third years and fourth years. Similarly,
315    previous studies reported that intern NSs had low compliance with SPs (Cruz et al., 2018;
316    Alshammari et al., 2018; Colet et al., 2017). These findings imply that students' exposure to
317    clinical settings increases, so does their compliance with SPs. The duration of their involvement
318    in clinical placements increases as the year of study among NSs participating in our study
319    increases, and students, particularly fourth-year NSs, take responsibility like nurses in clinical
320    placements and encounter more complex situations. These circumstances may cause NSs'

compliance with SPs to wane as the study year progresses. The current study found that NSs who had needle-stick injuries or had contact with blood/body fluids had low compliance with SPs. Similarly, Moon et al. (2019) reported that compliance with SPs is lower among NSs who have experienced needle-stick injury. According to this study, having a needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids were predictors of compliance with SPs. Some SPs (such as recapping used needles after injections, storing used sharps in sharps boxes, and so on) are also effective in preventing needlestick injuries, which can lead to serious or fatal infections with bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B, hepatitis C, or HIV (NIOSH, 2021). Strict compliance to SPs can reduce exposure to blood/body fluids and needlestick injuries. These findings highlight the importance of SPs in both preventing needlestick injuries and HAIs.

**Limitations**

While this study contributed valuable findings to the literature, it did have some limitations. A convenience sample of NSs from one nursing school was used to collect data. As a result, the generalizability of results may be limited. Furthermore, the CSPS is a self-reported questionnaire. This can lead to social desirability bias in respondents.

## Conclusions

The main strategy for preventing health-related infections is compliance with SPs. Strict compliance to SPs is required to ensure the safety of patients and HCWs. According to this study, the compliance with SPs was relatively higher among Turkish NSs during the pandemic. Compliance with SPs was high among NSs in terms of decontamination of spills and used articles, as well as waste disposal. However, there were obvious issues with sharp disposal compliance among NSs. Gender, study year, and previous needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids were all predictors of compliance with SPs. Males and NSs who had a needlestick injury or had contact with blood/body fluids had lower compliance with SPs than others. It is critical to cultivate and sustain a supportive culture of SPs compliance among NSs. A culture of strict compliance to SPs should be supported by training hospitals, nursing schools, and clinical nurse educators. It is recommended that strategies similar to those hospitals to prevent COVID-19 transmission during the pandemic (training, follow-up, observation, etc.) be used to increase compliance with SPs. More research is needed to determine the impact of the pandemic on NS compliance with SPs.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank everyone who helped with this study. We are grateful to Ege University Planning and Monitoring Coordination of Organizational Development and Directorate of Library and Documantation for their support in editing and proofreading service of this study.

## References

**Albaqawi HM, Alquwez N, Balay-Odao E, Bajet JB, Alabdulaziz H, Alsolami F, Tumala RB, Alsharari AF, Tork HMM, Felemban EM, Cruz JP.** 2020. Nursing students' perceptions, knowledge, and preventive behaviors toward COVID-19: a multi-university study. *Frontiers in Public Health,* 8, 573390.

365 **Alshammari F, Cruz JP, Alquwez N, Almazan J, Alsolami F, Tork H, Alabdulaziz H,**
366     **Felemban EM et al.** 2018. Compliance with standard precautions during clinical training
367     of nursing students in Saudi Arabia: A multi-university study. *The journal of Infection in*
368     *Developing Countries,* 12(11):937-945.
369 **Arruum D, Novieastari E, Gayatri D, Ayu NMS**. 2021. The factors impacting nurses
370     awareness on prevention healthcare-associated infections: a systematic review.
371     *Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 9(F), 595-600.
372 **Baccolini V, Migliara G, Isonne C, Dorelli B, Barone LC, Giannini D, Marotto D, Mart M,**
373     **Mazzalai E, Alessandri F, Pugliese F, Ceccarelli G, De Vito C, Marzuillo C, De**
374     **Giusti M, Villari P.** 2021. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare-
375     associated infections in intensive care unit patients: a retrospective cohort study.
376     *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*, 10(1), 1-9.
377 **Baker MA, Sands KE, Huang SS, Kleinman K, Septimus EJ, Varma N, Blanchard J,**
378     **Poland RE, Coady MH, Yokoe DS, Fraker S, Froman A, Moody J, Goldin L, Isaacs**
379     **A, Kleja K, Korwek KM, Stelling J, Clark A, Platt R, Perlin JB.** 2022. The impact of
380     coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) on healthcare-associated infections. *Clinical*
381     *Infectious Diseases*, *74*(10), 1748-1754.
382 **Balegha AN, Yidana A, Abiiro GA**. 2021. Knowledge, attitude and practice of hepatitis B
383     infection prevention among nursing students in the Upper West Region of Ghana: A
384     cross-sectional study. *PloS one*, 16(10), e0258757.
385 **Bouchoucha SL, Phillips NM, Lucas J, Kilpatrick M, Hutchinson A.** 2021. An investigation
386     into nursing students' application of infection prevention and control precautions. *Nurse*
387     *Education Today*, *104*, 104987.
388 **Brosio F, Kuhdari P, Stefanati A, Sulcaj N, Lupi S, Guidi E, et al. Bergamini M, Gabutti G.**
389     2017. Knowledge and behaviour of nursing students on the prevention of healthcare
390     associated infections. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene*, 58(2), E99.
391 **Büyük ET, Rızalar S, Yüksel P, Yüksel VT.** 2016. Öğrencilerin Delici Kesici Aletlerle
392     Yaralanma Deneyimleri Ve Bu Konuda Uygulama Alanında Yapılan Eğitimin Bilgi
393     Düzeylerine Etkisi. *Samsun Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, *1*(1), 167-178.
394 **Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC).** 2022. Healthcare-Associated Infections
395     (HAIs)- COVID-19 Impact on HAIs. Available at
396     https://www.cdc.gov/hai/data/portal/covid-impact-hai.html#anchor_1654807396312
397     (Accessed 8 November 2022).
398 **Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC).** 2018. Standard precautions.
399     https://www.cdc.gov/oralhealth/infectioncontrol/summary-infection-prevention-
400     practices/standard-precautions.html
401 **Colet PC, Cruz JP, Alotaibi KA, Colet, MKA, Islam SMS**. 2017. Compliance with standard
402     precautions among baccalaureate nursing students in a Saudi university: A self-report
403     study. *Journal of Infection and Public Health* 2017; 10: 421-430

404  **Cruz JP.** 2019. Infection prevention climate and its influence on nursing students' compliance
405      with standard precautions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 75(5), 1042-1052.

406  **Deiana G, Arghittu A, Gentili D, Dettori M, Palmieri A, Masia MD, Azara A, Castiglia P.**
407      2022. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the prevalence of HAIs and the use of
408      antibiotics in an Italian University Hospital. *Healthcare*, 10(9), 1597.

409  **Donati D, Biagioli V, Cianfrocca C, De Marinis MG,  Tartaglini D.** 2019. Compliance with
410      standard precautions among clinical nurses: validity and reliability of the Italian version
411      of the Compliance with Standard Precautions Scale (CSPS-It). *International Journal of
412      Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(1), 121.

413  **Dormann CF, Elith J, Bacher S, Buchmann C, Carl G, Carré G, Marquez JRG, Gruber B,**
414      **Lafourcade B, Leitão PJ, Münkemüller T, McClean C, Osborne PE, Reineking B,**
415      **Schröder B, Skidmore, AK, Zurel D, Lautenbach S.** 2013. Collinearity: a review of
416      methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their
417      performance. *Ecography*, 36(1), 27-46.

418  **European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).** 2022. Healthcare-associated
419      infections. Available at  https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthcare-associated-infections
420      (Accessed 1 July 2022)

421  **European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).** 2018. Healthcare-associated
422      infectons   a   threst   to   patient   safety   in   Europe.   Available   at
423      https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/infographic-healthcare-associated-
424      infections-threat-patient-safety-europe (Accessed 12 April 2022)

425  **Jia H, Li L, Li W, Hou T, Ma H, Yang Y, Wu A, Liu Y, Wen J, Yang H, Luo X, Xing Y,**
426      **Zhang W, Wu Y, Ding L, Liu W, Li Y, Chen M.** 2019. Impact of healthcare-associated
427      infections on length of stay: a study in 68 hospitals in China. *BioMed Research
428      International*, 2590563.

429  **Kepenek E, Şahin-Eker HB.** 2017. An assessment of sharp injuries to workers in a State
430      Hospital. *Klimik Dergisi*, 30(2), 78-82.

431  **Lam  SC.** 2011. Universal to standard precautions in disease prevention: preliminary
432      development of compliance scale for clinical nursing. *Int. J. Nurs. Stud*. 48 (12), 1533–
433      1539.

434  **Lam, SC.** 2014. Validation and cross-cultural pilot testing of compliance with standard
435      precautions scale: self-administered instrument for clinical nurses. *Infection Control &
436      Hospital Epidemiology*, 2014, 35.5: 547-555.

437  **Lastinger LM, Alvarez CR, Kofman A, Konnor RY, Kuhar DT, Nkwata A, Patel PR,**
438      **Pattabiraman V, Xu SY, Dudeck MA**. 2022. Continued increases in HAI incidence
439      during the second year of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Infection Control & Hospital
440      Epidemiology*, 1-19.

441  **McCabe R, Schmit N, Christen P, D'Aeth JC, Løchen A, Rizmie D, et al. Nayagam S,**
442      **Miraldo M, Aylin P, Alex B, Perez-Guzman PN, Ghani AC, Ferguson NM, White**

443       **PJ, Hauck K.** 2020. Adapting hospital capacity to meet changing demands during the
444       COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Med.*, 18:1–12.

445 **Menteşe HÖ, Karaca A.** 2021**.** Hemşirelik ve ebelik öğrencilerinin kesici-delici alet
446       yaralanmasına ilişkin bilgi düzeyleri. *Klimik Journal/Klimik Dergisi*, *34*(3).

447 **Mestrovic T, Neuberg M, Kozina G.** 2020. Compliance with standard precautions among
448       University nursing students from Croatia: a cross-sectional study. *Infection Control &*
449       *Hospital Epidemiology*, 41(S1), s180-s180.

450 **Moon K, Hyeon YH, Lim KH.** 2019**.** Factors associated with nursing students' compliance
451       with standard precautions: a self-reported survey. *International Journal of Infection*
452       *Control,* 15(3).

453 **Sandbøl SG, Glassou EN, Ellermann-Eriksen S, Haagerup A.** 2022. Hand hygiene
454       compliance among healthcare workers before and during the COVID-19
455       pandemic. *American Journal of Infection Control*.

456 **Stangerup M, Hansen MB, Hansen R, Sode LP, Hesselbo B, Kostadinov K, Olesen BS,**
457       **Calum H.** 2021. Hand hygiene compliance of healthcare workers before and during the
458       COVID-19 pandemic: a long-term follow-up study. *American Journal of Infection*
459       *Control*, *49*(9), 1118-1122.

460 **The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)**. 2021. Needlestick
461       injuries       are       preventable.       Available       at
462       https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/newsroom/feature/needlestick_disposal.html (Accessed date).

463 **U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).** 2021. Health care-associated
464       infections.       Available       at       https://www.hhs.gov/oidp/topics/health-care-associated-
465       infections/index.html#:~:text=Healthcare%2Dassociated%20infections%20(HAIs),and%
466       20long%2Dterm%20care%20facilities. (Accessed 1 November 2022).

467 **Wee LEI, Conceicao EP, Tan JY, Magesparan KD, Amin IBM, Ismail BBS, Toh HX, Jin P,**
468       **Zhang J, Wee EGL, Ong SJM, Lee GLX, Wang AE, How MKB, Tan KY, Lee LC,**
469       **Phoon PC, Yang Y, Aung MK, Sim XYJ, Venkatachalam I, Ling ML.** 2021.
470       Unintended consequences of infection prevention and control measures during COVID-
471       19 pandemic. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 49(4), 469-477.

472 **Weiner-Lastinger LM, Pattabiraman V, Konnor RY, Patel PR, Wong E, Xu SY, Smith B,**
473       **Edwards JR, Dudeck MA**. 2022. The impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)
474       on healthcare-associated infections in 2020: a summary of data reported to the National
475       Healthcare Safety Network. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 43(1), 12-25.

476 **World Health Organization (WHO).** 2020a. Who timeline-Covid-19. Available at
477       https://www.who.int/news/item/27-04-2020-who-timeline---covid-19 (Accessed 1 July
478       2022)

479 **World Health Organization (WHO).** 2021. Infection prevention and control during health care
480       when coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is suspected or confirmed. Available at
481       https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-IPC-2021.1 (Accessed 1 July
482       2022)

483 **World Health Organization (WHO).** 2022. Standard precautions for the prevention and control
484      of infections: aide-memoire. Available at https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-
485      UHL-IHS-IPC-2022.1 (Accessed 1 November 2022).
486 **World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe.** 2020b. Strengthening the health
487      system response to COVID-19: technical guidance #1: maintaining the delivery of
488      essential health care services while mobilizing the health workforce for the COVID-19
489      response. Available at https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332559. (Accessed 1 July
490      2022)
491 **Xiong P, Zhang J, Wang X, Wu TL, Hall BJ.** 2017. Effects of a mixed media education
492      intervention program on increasing knowledge, attitude, and compliance with standard
493      precautions among nursing students: A randomized controlled trial. *American journal of*
494      *infection control*, *45*(4), 389-395.
495

Characteristics of Nursing Students

1 **Table 1: Characteristics of nursing students.**

| Characteristics (N = 816) | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age (Mean ± SS)** | 21.30 ± 1.31 | | |
| **Gender** | Female | 703 | 86.2 |
| | Male | 113 | 13.8 |
| **Year of Study** | Second year | 311 | 38.1 |
| | Third year | 274 | 33.6 |
| | Fourth year | 231 | 28.3 |
| **Needlestick injury or contact with blood/body fluids** | Yes | 70 | 8.6 |
| | No | 746 | 91.4 |

Compliance with Standard Precautions

1    **Table 2: Compliance of nursing students with standard precautions (N = 816).**

| Items | Compliance rate % |
|---|---|
| **Use of protective device** | **78.7** |
| Q7. I remove Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) in a designated area. | 78.7 |
| Q10. I wear gloves when I am exposed to body fluids, blood products and any excretion of patients. | 93.0 |
| Q13. I wear a surgical mask alone or in combination with goggles, face shield and apron whenever there is a possibility of a splash or splatter. | 68.0 |
| Q14. My mouth and nose are covered when I wear a mask. | 97.1 |
| Q15. I reuse a surgical mask or disposable PPE | 69.1 |
| Q16. I wear a gown or apron when exposed to blood, body fluids or any patient excretions. | 66.4 |
| **Disposal of sharps** | **66.5** |
| Q4. I recap used needles after giving an injection. | 38.6 |
| Q5. I put used sharp articles into sharps boxes | 97.7 |
| Q6. The sharps box is disposed only when it is full. | 63.1 |
| **Disposal of waste** | **81.5** |
| Q17. Waste contaminated with blood, body fluids, secretion and excretion is placed in red plastic bag s irrespective of the patient's infection status. | 81.5 |
| **Decontamination of spills and used article** | **85.0** |
| Q18. I decontaminate surfaces and equipment after use. | 91.4 |
| Q19. I wear gloves to decontaminate used equipment with visible soils. | 86.6 |
| Q20. I clean up spillage of blood or other body fluids immediately with disinfectants | 77.0 |
| **Prevention of cross infection from person to person** | **75.5** |
| Q1.I wash my hands between patient contacts. | 84.4 |
| Q2. I only use water for hand washing | 74.3 |
| Q3. I use alcoholic hand rubs as an alternative if my hands are not visibly soiled | 55.4 |
| Q8. I take a shower in case of extensive splashing even after I have put on PPE. | 60.5 |
| Q9. I cover my wound(s) or lesion(s) with waterproof dressing before patient contacts. | 77.8 |
| Q11. I change gloves between patient contacts | 85.2 |
| Q12. I decontaminate my hands immediately after removal of gloves. | 91.1 |
| **CSPS** | **76.8** |

Regression Analysis

1  **Table 3: Factors influencing nursing students' compliance with SPs (N = 816).**

| Predictor variable | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized coefficients | | | CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **t** | **p** | **Lower bound** | **Upper bound** |
| Gender (reference group:female) | −17.30 | 2.01 | −0.26 | −8.62 | 0.01 | −21.24 | −13.36 |
| Year of study (reference group: second-year) | | | | | | | |
| Third year | −5.66 | 1.61 | −0.12 | −3.51 | 0.01 | −8.83 | −2.49 |
| Fourth year (İnternship) | −9.71 | 1.72 | −0.19 | −5.65 | 0.01 | −13.01 | −6.34 |
| Needlesstick injury or contact with blood/body fluids (reference group:no) | −32.93 | 2.45 | −0.40 | −13.42 | 0.01 | −37.74 | −28.11 |
| R = 0.53, R² = 0.28, F = 77.75, p = 0.01 | | | | | | | |

R = 0.53, $R^2$ = 0.28, F = 77.75, p = 0.01

2  B is the unstandardized coefficients; SE is the standard error; β is standardized beta; p is level of
3  significance as $p < 0.05$; CI is confidence interval